

FILED**12/16/2021**

Pro Se 15 (Rev. 12/16) Complaint for Violation of Civil Rights (Non-Prisoner)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA**
Roger A.G. Sharpe, Clerk

for the

Southern District of Indiana

Terre Haute Division

Manetiony Clervrain; Francis Cobbina Osei-
Fosu; Medgine Sarah Jean; Jean Gardy
Gedeon; Ronaldo Jean; Slidjhie Francois; Mischael
Smith; Abel Paul; Vanderley Jefferson W. J.
Dazemar; Kharie Michelle Gustave; Shakira Sherlandy
Joseph; Maha Joslin; Shella Joslin; Brandako, Inc

Case No. 1:21-cv-03094-RLY-DML

*(to be filled in by the Clerk's Office)**Plaintiff(s)*

*(Write the full name of each plaintiff who is filing this complaint.
If the names of all the plaintiffs cannot fit in the space above,
please write "see attached" in the space and attach an additional
page with the full list of names.)*

Jury Trial: (check one) ☒ Yes ☐ No**-v-**

Geoffrey S. Mearns; Renae Conley; Matt
Momper; Mike McDaniel; Brian Gallagher; Henry
Hall; Rick Hall; Jean Ann Harcourt; Mark
Hardwick; Amy Jean Crosby; Sali Falling; Alan
Finn; Beth Goetz; Paula Luff; Loren Malm; Sue Hodges
Moore; Rebecca Rice; Susana Rivera-Mills; Ro-Anne
Royer Engle Wyse; Ken Ofori-Atta; Charles Adu
Boahen; Hon. Dr. Owusu Afriyie Akoto; Dr. Yaw Osei
Adutwum; Dr. Yaw Osei Adutwum; Hon. Dominic
Aduna Bingab Nitiwul; Hon. Ursula Owusu-
Ekuful; Hon. Daniel Botwe; Ambrose Dery; Hon.
Mustapha Ussif; Justin Trudeau; Chrystia
Freeland; Lawrence MacAulay; Carolyn
Bennett; Dominic LeBlanc; Jean-Yves Duclos; Marie-
Claude Bibeau; Melanie Joly; Diane
Lebouthiller; Harjit S. Sajjan; Carla Qualtrough; Patty
Hajdu; Francois-Phillippe Champagne; Karina Gould;
Ahmed Hussen; Ginette Petitpas Taylor; Seamus
O'Regan; Pablo Rodriguez; Bill Blair; Mary
Ng; Filomena Tassi; Jonathan Wilkinson; David
Lametti; Joyce Murray; Anita Anand; Mona
Fortier; Steven Guilbeault; Marco Mendicino; Marc
Miller; Dan Vandal; Omar Alghabra; Randy
Boissonnault; Sean Fraser; Mark Holland Gудie
Hutchings; Marci Len; Helena Jaczek; Kamal
Khera; Pascale St-Onge; Ariel Henry; Supplice
Daniel; Sylien Legrand Wilkensy; Casimir Pierre
Richard; Joazil Rodolphe; St-cyr P. Elie; Guerlyne
Residor; Bijoux Josette; Joseph Levelt; Laraque
Ashley; Joseph Genard; Novia Augustin; Victor
Andre; Duchatellier Rachelle; Preval Rhode.

Defendant(s)

(Write the full name of each defendant who is being sued. If the names of all the defendants cannot fit in the space above, please write "see attached" in the space and attach an additional page with the full list of names. Do not include addresses here.)

COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS

(Non-Prisoner Complaint)

NOTICE

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 5.2 addresses the privacy and security concerns resulting from public access to electronic court files. Under this rule, papers filed with the court should *not* contain: an individual's full social security number or full birth date; the full name of a person known to be a minor; or a complete financial account number. A filing may include *only*: the last four digits of a social security number; the year of an individual's birth; a minor's initials; and the last four digits of a financial account number.

Except as noted in this form, plaintiff need not send exhibits, affidavits, grievance or witness statements, or any other materials to the Clerk's Office with this complaint.

In order for your complaint to be filed, it must be accompanied by the filing fee or an application to proceed in forma pauperis.

I. The Parties to This Complaint

A. The Plaintiff(s)

Provide the information below for each plaintiff named in the complaint. Attach additional pages if needed.

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Name | Manetirony Clervrain | | |
| Address | 4326 S Setterfield Rd Suite 153 | | |
| | Anderson | IN | 46013 |
| | <i>City</i> | <i>State</i> | <i>Zip Code</i> |
| County | | | |
| Telephone Number | 765-278-9806 | | |
| E-Mail Address | monticlerivain@gmail.com | | |

B. The Defendant(s)

Provide the information below for each defendant named in the complaint, whether the defendant is an individual, a government agency, an organization, or a corporation. For an individual defendant, include the person's job or title (if known) and check whether you are bringing this complaint against them in their individual capacity or official capacity, or both. Attach additional pages if needed.

Defendant No. 1

Name Geoffrey S. Mearns

Job or Title *(if known)* President of Ball State University

Address 2000 W. University Ave.

Muncie IN 47306

City State Zip Code

County _____

Telephone Number _____

E-Mail Address *(if known)* _____

☒ Individual capacity ☒ Official capacity

Defendant No. 2

Name Richard Harvey

Job or Title *(if known)* President of Liberty Christian School

Address 2323 Columbus Ave

Anderson IN 46016

City State Zip Code

County _____

Telephone Number _____

E-Mail Address *(if known)* _____

☒ Individual capacity ☒ Official capacity

Defendant No. 3

Name Clifford J. White III

Job or Title *(if known)* Director of U.S. Trustee Program

Address 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington DC 20530

City State Zip Code

County _____

Telephone Number _____

E-Mail Address *(if known)* _____

☒ Individual capacity ☒ Official capacity

Defendant No. 4

Name Chrystia Freeland

Job or Title *(if known)* Minister of Finance in Canada

Address 80,rue Wellington

Ottawa ON K1A0A2

City State Zip Code

County _____

Pro Se 15 (Rev. 12/16) Complaint for Violation of Civil Rights (Non-Prisoner)

Telephone Number _____

E-Mail Address (*if known*) _____

☒ Individual capacity

☒ Official capacity

II. Basis for Jurisdiction

Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, you may sue state or local officials for the "deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and [federal laws]." Under *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), you may sue federal officials for the violation of certain constitutional rights.

A. Are you bringing suit against (*check all that apply*):

☒ Federal officials (a *Bivens* claim)

☒ State or local officials (a § 1983 claim)

B. Section 1983 allows claims alleging the "deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and [federal laws]." 42 U.S.C. § 1983. If you are suing under section 1983, what federal constitutional or statutory right(s) do you claim is/are being violated by state or local officials?

Thus, it is true that the defendants extensive conspiracy involved the violation of the Banking industry, or additional claims for ["Class of One"] or Exclusion can be proving within this ["Motion for Enforcing Power or Development, or Development Guidance Against Facility Act by Invoking the Ant(s) Nationality Act"] ("TANA"), or they are additional claims for the defendants justify controlling theory, indeed the motion is pending to file to the various courts against the giant involved exclusion to due process, or for them to justify why" the plaintiff can not open ["Credit cards"], or Bank Account after being convicted.....additionally, to prove National Origin Discrimination is another issues to be proving by circumstantial of the evidence within the the same meaning for controversies claim..then we asking the courts if Chevron doctrine must be clarified Under the Chevron doctrine , a federal court embarks on a two-part test in determining whether to defer to an agency's construction of a statute. First, the court must consider whether Congress has "directly spoken to the precise question at issue, or for which the defendant must show good cause exception, We believe these facts are sufficiently outrageous to satisfy the first element of a cause of action against the officials, or defendants across the Nation for failure to act when the situations are so required, for the same reason they are liable for additional damages for 1) [The allegation for ratification Theory has met that is because the plaintiff has filed evidence in the mail cases [21-CV-00326"], and the defendants are liable for intervening cause that is part of the conspiracy claims upon reliefs can be granted, including additional damages, 2) The only question presented here is whether we should overrule those decisions, discarding the deference they give to agencies. We answer that question by means of ["Auer deference"] retains an important role in construing agency regulations. But even as we uphold it, we are asking for reinforce the limits. Auer deference is sometimes appropriate only in his circumstances presenting, or . whether to apply it depends on a range of considerations that we have noted now and again, but compile and further develop today. The deference doctrine we describe is potent in its place, but cabined in its scope. On remand, the Court of Appeals should decide whether it applies to the agency interpretation at issue against injustice, 3) under a theory of respondeat superior the defendants, and their employees are violations of § 1981, or constructive notice for intervening cause action, so as to relieve the original wrongdoer of liability, provided the intervening act could have reasonably been foreseen and the conduct [of the original wrongdoer] was a substantial factor in bringing about the harm, which the Attorney is presenting to protect his family against further dangerous theory, including to remove those activist in country such Haiti, among the other or any country where he has invoked that is not the United States of America, if the the Supreme Court held that Congress did not intend in the Federal Tort Claims Act ("FTCA"), 28 U.S.C. § 1346, to permit pendent-party jurisdiction. The FTCA provides that "the district courts . . . shall have exclusive jurisdiction of civil actions on claims against the United States" for certain torts of federal employees acting within the scope of their employment. 28 U.S.C. § 1346(b). Petitioner seeks to append her claims against the city and the utility to her FTCA action against the United States, even though this would require the District Court to extend its authority to additional parties for whom an independent jurisdictional base — such as diversity of citizenship, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) (1) — is not lacking, that is because ["17-CV-03194"], or among the the other to be filed in different courts, or for the courts to certify the cases under Article III, whether a federal court in a diversity action may exercise supplemental jurisdiction over additional plaintiffs whose claims do satisfy the minimum amount-in-controversy requirement, or If § 1367(a) were the sum total of the relevant statutory language, our holding would rest on that language alone. The statute, of course, instructs us to examine § 1367(b) to determine if any of its exceptions apply, so we proceed to that section. While § 1367(b) qualifies the broad rule of § 1367(a), it does not withdraw supplemental jurisdiction over the claims of the additional parties at issue here. The specific exceptions to § 1367(a) contained in § 1367(b), moreover, provide additional support for our conclusion that § 1367(a) confers supplemental jurisdiction over these claims. Section 1367(b), which applies only to diversity cases, withholds supplemental jurisdiction over the claims of plaintiffs proposed to be joined as indispensable parties under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 19, or who seek to intervene pursuant to Rule 24. Nothing in the text of § 1367(b), however, withholds supplemental jurisdiction over the claims of plaintiffs permissively joined under Rule 20 ["like the additional plaintiffs "] or certified as class-action members pursuant to Rule 23 (like the additional plaintiffs to be filed by the intervenors,. natural, indeed the necessary, inference is that § 1367 confers supplemental jurisdiction over claims by Rule 20.

- C. Plaintiffs suing under *Bivens* may only recover for the violation of certain constitutional rights. If you are suing under *Bivens*, what constitutional right(s) do you claim is/are being violated by federal officials?

Under this case ["21-MC-00108"], for which the plaintiff filed this ["Motion for Opposition , or eviction Notices, or Illegally by conviction for the Market Issues Manipulating Act ("MIMA), these motions is filed to question both ["Well Fargo"], and ["Chase"] among the others pending to file, or question to justification their actions by additional claims as part fo the Settement Process, at ["Dkt, 8] against unreasonable Classification by the Giants, that also include this courts ["5D21-2146"] ,upon the courts state courts failed to consider the various important factors, that is including Amending Notice of Appeals, which was filed ["2021-CC-008307-O"], or failed to release the administrative records to the appeals procedure, then we asking if the courts are also liable for additional claimsit now instructs that "a grant of jurisdiction over claims involving particular parties does itself confer jurisdiction over additional claims by or against different parties.. This rule, the Court asserts, is necessary to provide Congress "a background of clear interpretative rules" and to avoid sowing confusion.. But as a method of statutory interpretation, the Court's approach is neither clear nor faithful to our judicial obligation to discern congressional intent. While with respect to the joinder of additional defendants on pendent state claims, the Court's mandate is now clear, its approach offers little guidance with respect to the many other claims that a court must address in the course of deciding a constitutional case. Because the Court provides no reason why the joinder of pendent defendants over whom there is no other basis of federal jurisdiction should differ from the joinder of pendent claims and other pendent parties, I fear that its approach will confuse more than it clarifies. How much more clear to assume — especially when the courts have long so held — that with respect to all of these situations Congress intended the Federal Rules to govern unless Congress has indicated otherwise.

- D. Section 1983 allows defendants to be found liable only when they have acted "under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia." 42 U.S.C. § 1983. If you are suing under section 1983, explain how each defendant acted under color of state or local law. If you are suing under *Bivens*, explain how each defendant acted under color of federal law. Attach additional pages if needed.

Under ("NIRTA") is a matter for additional claim including, to consolidated cases where jurisdiction are available, or see ["Motion for Settlement Agreement(s) against Secretive Criminals by invoking the National Regulatory Treaties Act ("NIRTA"), indeed, matter for mitigating financial burden or for the courts to grant ("IFP") without additional restriction against the activists, thus, it is true that any allegation for Moot Status, Without or with prejudice required investigation by the United States Attorney Office or Department of Justice will justice allegation against the agencies nationwide claims ["20-CV-10046"], or matter to question federal circuit court to evaluate several motions seeking the various reliefs upon reliefs can be granted ["Dkt, 3; 6; 1-17"], or for the defendants to show causes across the country ["21-02131"], including to proceed in format pauperis against the various criminals, or also for termination of Permanent resident Illegal Removal or deportation, and the vacatur of their convictions, as well as for a new case by enforcing criminal law, see [21-01865, at Dkt, 5"] or matter for conspiracy by reopening all of the cases where controversy is applicable, or on June November 5, 2020, which imposed the court imposed restriction or evidence against the officials for failure to waive or failure to grant ("IFF") as a matter of laws, then noted that the case was closed without justification, which the plaintiff is inquiring for public debate against both the democrats and republican parties ["21-CV-00326"], or where the plaintiff has filed the evidence, then the defendants actions are questionable for additional jurisdiction ["28 U.S.C 1295; 28 U.S.C 1346; 28 U.S.C 1631"], then we asking for additional jurisdiction for appeal procedures, when an appeals its filed any any courts of the United States, not to exclude ["21-02258"; 21-11150"] to determine jurisdiction is applicable for the interest of justice by transfer the cases in exceptional situation to allow out of time appeals to proceed, then we asking for majority opinion to ligate against the various judicial officials under ("NIRTA"), or matter for settlement Agreements, which the courts will not denied the constitutional violations, where each courts should be their own cost, *Manetirony Clervrain v. Quincy L Booth* Docket 2:20-cv-10046, California Central District Court (Oct. 29, 2020), see Also ["Dkt, 15"], or matter for applying Rule 42. Consolidation; Separate Trials, as well as for the courts to considering, of if, whether the question for decision in these case is one of procedure: is the criminal contempt of nonviolently and respectfully refusing to testify at a criminal trial punishable summarily by the trial judge pursuant to Fed. Rule Crim. Proc. 42(a), or must the trial judge prosecute the contempt on notice pursuant to Rule 42(b), allowing a reasonable time for the preparation of the defense? A trial judge in the District Court under ("NIRTA"), at page 16-23, must compel the administrative records, or matter for evaluating serious crimes by the defendants actions, or punished respondents under subdivision (a) of Rule 42 if they refusing to testify at a trial, at page 32-40, for Assistant United States Attorneys ("AUSAs") to initiate criminal investigation against the various officials across the country ["12-CV-CR-20193"], for which the court in Florida failed to file the various motions under the above cases, or similarly claims against the defendant for illegal prosecutions, against african people, which the defendants could not denied the claim by applying the concept of ("MOCMA") will justified ("TAJA") discriminatory intent, in light of the circumstances the defendants are liable under the applicable laws, see, *Clervrain et al v. United States Of America et al* Docket ["21-cv-62266"], Florida Southern District Court (Nov. 1, 2021) at ["Dkt,10"] for failure to review administrative records upon reliefs can be granted including damages that must release for administrative cost within 30 days, as the plaintiff, Mr Clervrain, who is representing the various individual, or more than 31 individual in these cases to be admitted in the United States for additional reliefs, and exceptional circumstances is presenting to question dismissal complain without prejudice, by ["The Ant Library Act"] ("TALA"), or the invention upon the court failure to consider this case for controversy 28 U.S. Code § 1332 - Diversity of citizenship; amount in controversy; costs, or to benefits those about to admitted to United States as matter for constitutional claims, we will refer to [Mr.Clervrain] as the Attorney in record to ligate in behalf of the class without signature if the other plaintiff has giving him the right of General Power of Attorney to conducts business, or to include all expert testimony which most concern by the courts, and for scientific basic, if any for such analysis must be granted, which the plaintiff has inform the courts that the evidence under ("TANA") is required for additional reliefs, or if whether the public funding will lead to better education is matter of facts, Moreover, Parental Role is another question against mass incarceration and deportation even without the culture shocking by the defendants negligence misconduct, we meet that the education system require improment, they are for litigating rights.

III. Statement of Claim

State as briefly as possible the facts of your case. Describe how each defendant was personally involved in the alleged wrongful action, along with the dates and locations of all relevant events. You may wish to include further details such as the names of other persons involved in the events giving rise to your claims. Do not cite any cases or statutes. If more than one claim is asserted, number each claim and write a short and plain statement of each claim in a separate paragraph. Attach additional pages if needed.

A. Where did the events giving rise to your claim(s) occur?

The event occurred after release from Prison, which the activist alleged that the defendants discriminated against him, their failure to ratify the laws is the proximate cause of the injuries inflicted or attempt to closed his bank account by Chase is presentation for justification without justification, pending to prove with evidence as part of the controversies against control theory, see ["Motion for ["The Answer Act"] ("TAA") or Additional Defendants Act ("ADA") by the treaties Movement Protective Act] (TMPA), Thus the question is whether the courts must serve the Democrat Party and Republic Party to inform the public their misconducts, as evidence to prove the claims or significant loss of political Freedom, and values by both the United States of America and the other country listed on the controversies, particularly the Republic of Haiti, then he is asking for international extradition against the various politicians, by invoking the Uniform Criminal Extradition Act ("UCEA"), The extradition statute implements a provision of the United States Constitution, the failure by the defendants to invade Haiti by technicality will justify their actions, or for additional damages pending to apply right democracy by promoting economic growth, then we asking each of the courts why? why \$ 500 Billion Dollars should not be granted, and why" the courts should not certify the cases within 30 days to remove his pauperis Status so that he can hire additional individuals with different set of skills to help in the process of development of the ["World Educative Science Association"] ("WEDSA") a subdivision of ["Brandako, Inc"] which, like their modern counterparts, granted inventors "the right to exclude others from making, using, offering for sale, selling, or importing the patented invention," in exchange for full disclosure of an invention that must be managed by ["Prolifico, Inc"], or It has long been understood that a patent must describe the exact scope of an invention and its manufacture to "secure to [the patentee] all to which he is entitled, [and] to apprise the public of what is still open to them by the Brandbid, Inc or [The Ant Act (TAA), or for additional 350 Billion Dollars for initiating the development of Education in Haiti, among the other listed under ("TALA"), those brands will help in the process of educative funding across the world, or the evidence for conspiracy claims can be proving by circumstantial of the evidence against each of the defendants for conspiracy theory, or by the same analysis, the elements of conspiracy before considering conferral of jurisdiction under a civil conspiracy theory is being questioned by the ["Activist"], or ["The Attorney"] to question public opinion concerns by way of Development ["The New Commonwealth of Haiti,"], therefore the plaintiff is asking if we must freeze assets of those involved in the conspiracies, particularly those criminals involved in crimes against Humanity in the republic of Haiti, and United States Agencies to release another 100 Millions dollars against each of the Millions in Haiti, regardless where they have their funds, from the records, or evidence the funds will lead to Haitians Democracy after certain year of Occupation by the United States of America by applying legal, democracy rights, Here, ["Mr. Clervrain"] can be proving by both direct and circumstantial of evidence pending for majority opinion across the world, which the courts failed to provide any evidence the plaintiff complaint is rambling on multiple Ground, also matters for multiplicity of victims against the various agencies across the world for their negligence, as such being the case any allegation by the courts must respond within the entire records, include domestic and international factors, or very complex litigation to question if "Chase," "JPMorgan," "JPMorgan Chase," the JPMorgan Chase logo and the Octagon Symbol are trademarks of JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. is a wholly-owned subsidiary of JPMorgan Chase & Co. or if ["Mr. Clervrain"] is victimized by the defendants, or we recognized in the regulatory context a similar class-of-one theory of equal protection by invoking ("NIRTA") or additional claims for Settlement agreements, that the proposed laws is proscribes "discrimination arising not only from a legislative act but also from the conduct of an administrative official, also including the banking officials, it is true that where a more carefully drafted complaint might state additional claims for consolidated rights, without amending the complaint is matter for interest of justice, ["18-CV- 3041"] these matters are before the courts by the activist to protect public interest within the plain meaning of laws, ["Dkt, 48 ;33 ; 53; 17; 55; 26; 56; 27 pages"] , this court continually abused its discretion by failure to consider the claims against the defendants discriminatory intent, or matter to question is first amendment rights by the same courts ["17-CV-03194"], or evidence for first amendment rights concerning ("FOIA") Practices, as well as for his Nationality concerns within this courts to litigate rights ["18-CV-03039"] by the Federal circuit courts against injustice ["21-2134"], which the court should have had jurisdiction on the by this motion for amending controversies [Dkt, 78"],

B. What date and approximate time did the events giving rise to your claim(s) occur?

Under ("MOCMA") and ("DIFTA") they are matters for debatable concerns by the Politicians, or that that the plaintiff is presenting the the claims ["21-CV-02266] or ["Dkt 10, at page, 2, that is for further analysis by congressional intent, Similarly, if the majority is genuinely committed to deciphering congressional intent, its unwillingness to even consider evidence as to the context in which Congress legislated is perplexing. Congress does not legislate in a vacuum. As the respondents and the Government suggest, and as we have held several times, the objective manifestations of congressional intent to create a private right of action must be measured in light of the enacting Congress' expectations as to how the judiciary might evaluate the question by federal circuit court [21-2131] that is because jurisdiction is applicable within this court by the same motions claims by the kansas court for evaluate theclaim ["Dkt,80, 95 pages"] , and 81; 68 pages, accordingly the motions filed by the plaintiff should not be dismisses without proper justification, that to include for ["18-CV-03039, at 47, and ["18-03041"]]

C. What are the facts underlying your claim(s)? (For example: What happened to you? Who did what? Was anyone else involved? Who else saw what happened?)

The Jurisdictional rules should be clear. Whatever the virtues of the the Ant standard ['Motion for Enforcing Power; or Developing Guidance against Facially Attack by Inkoking The Ant(s) Nationalities Act"] ("TANA"), as explained before, or like the trial court, must draw all reasonable inferences supported by the evidence in favor of the non-moving party. We must then decide whether any genuine issues of material fact exist, and whether the district court correctly applied the relevant substantive law, although a plaintiff may rely on circumstantial evidence to show pretext, such evidence must be both specific and substantial, then we are asking for the court to compel the agencies action including why the defendants should release the administrative records concerning their practices of exclusion against the activist, which he has established a prima facie case of discrimination, even given the low threshold of evidence required to do so, we need not resolve this question definitively.

IV. Injuries

If you sustained injuries related to the events alleged above, describe your injuries and state what medical treatment, if any, you required and did or did not receive.

Here, the representative, or ["Mr.Clervrain"] or the victim of the criminal enterprises submitted the various motions, including ("IFP") form for himself, pending to file additional for those will admitted to United States ["21-2131"], at ["Dkt, 3"], that is for opposition, or eviction notices or illegality by conviction (s) ["Dkt, 6"] Dockets Statements benefits ["Dkt,13"] as well for extention to file brief (s), or to litigate Judicial withdrwn standard ["Dkt, 14"] Thus, the regulation clearly contemplates that ("USCIS's") must make appropriate decision will be based on an examination of the facts of the particular cases for controversies to protect the various Haitian, and the various activist, , for example, broader policy considerations or administrative convenience. Further, the requirement that must ("USCIS") consider humanitarian reasons " also does allow the agencies to make appropriate decisions, to be included, with the plaintiff invention as part of the controversies or ground for them to admitted in the United states, a decision based on procedural reasons , such as the timing is within the applicable law, congress has mandated, under I-602 as a waiver. Although the term " humanitarian reasons, or assure family Unity in the Public Interest ["Dkt, 15"] , also to inform the public that the ("INA") is unconstitutional by enforcing discriminatory , if whether the claim against ["Alien Status"] is undisputable facts, and ["Pauperis Status"], if that is what the plaintiff is askign the courts to inform the defendants they must act within 30 days ["Dkt, 17"] so that he coul have his managment team for the first stage fo the procedures, that is because the plaintiff is question the law by the same concept of ("MOCMA") or to prove that the defedants relevant conducts by applying words and terms to committed serious crimes against humanity, ["Dkt, 21"] we held that the question of congressional power under the Commerce Clause "is necessarily one of degree." To the same effect is for concurring opinion against the judicial system withn the motions filed ["Dkt,22"], then are asking for disposition concerns, and "to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsels, and for litigants accross the Nations to intervene ["Dkt, 23"] we must concluded that the court has absolute jurisdiction and supplemental Judidiction to serve the defendants accross to show good cause, among other things for violated by the ["RICO Act"], or the restriction imposed against his first amendment is evidence for predicated Act, as here, for their official acts" In sum, we conclude the district court had original jurisdiction over the ("RICO") claim stated in of the complaint and pendent jurisdiction over the state law claims statedin all claims alleged These claims were properly broungh under section 1441(a). The district court has supplemental jurisdiction over the claims arising under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 because of the exclusive nature of jurisdiction over the 1934 Act and the application, in this case, of the derivative jurisdiction is not bar. The Federal Court of claim must enforce its power,, in concluding it had jurisdiction over the claims arising under the Securities Act of 1933. These claims were not removable either under section 1441(a), because of the express statutory prohibition on removal from state court, or under section 1441(c), because the RICO claim was not separate and independent from the claim predicated on the 1933 Act. Accordingly, the district court lacked jurisdiction over the 1933 Act claim in the first instance and should have remanded this portion of the action to state court. 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c) (1982).

V. Relief

State briefly what you want the court to do for you. Make no legal arguments. Do not cite any cases or statutes. If requesting money damages, include the amounts of any actual damages and/or punitive damages claimed for the acts alleged. Explain the basis for these claims.

At this point the plaintiff is asking for immediate reliefs to be release certification of trust to the appropriate bank accross the country, and that must be granted for hired process within 30 days , as well for his operations of the invention or also know as Prolifico, Inc or subdivision of Brandako, Inc , as well as he is asking for \$160 billions for the alleged injuris in facts , \$135 billions Dollors for the development of the ["brandako, Inc"] , and \$200 Millions dollars against each individuals involved in the conspiracy, that is because they are also liable for ["intrvning cause"], ["ratification theory"], ["respondead superior"] or failure to ratify the alleged punitive laws..... among the others to be developed by laws.... and for the courts to docket the defendants information properly upon electronically file the motion so call ("TANA") and ("TALA"), then we asking the court for National reliefs against judicial officials restrictions, or another \$ 6 billion for exemplary damages or additional liabily against them for failure to allow ["Non-Attorney Access"] to electronic filling, this Notice (s) to the court for docketing statements to litigate by invoking uder ("MOCMA") at, page 94-99 stattes additional defendants as well as under ("TALA"), at page 42-50, it is matter for[" invention right"], or ["Protection Rights"] and ["Trademark rights"] by both domestic and international defendants to protect the plaintiff names, idealogistic concern against criminal enterprises within this ["Notice to the courts for Dockets Statements to litigate by National Electronic Filling Reform Act (NEFRA) or for Initiating legal process to protect public interest by the ["National Infomative Public Grievouous Association ("NIPGA"); ["National Educative Bar Association Science "] ["NEDBAS"] and the Word Educative Science Association ("WEDSA) to be developed wordewide by invoking public opinions , or right for pubication at the defendants expenses, that must include all other damages upon other investigation while in the presedures of the claims and his ("FOIA") must be granted additional damages, among the others to litigate controversies, or any other reliefs to court might find just and proper....particularly for consolidated related cases within the same jurisdiction, and for the plaintiff families, friends, and other activist to be admitted to the united States within 30 days after the courts recived the compplaint against the defendants, or within existing jurisdiction if any existed... ["20-CV-01306"],["21-CV-02918"],["21-CV-03306"],we note that the Class Action Fairness Act ("CAFA") does not moot the significance of our interpretation of § 1367, as many proposed exercises of supplemental jurisdiction, even in the class-action context, might not fall within the CAFA's ambit. The ["CAFA"] , then, has it impact, one way or the other, on our interpretation of § 1367. Indeed, it broadly authorizes the district courts to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over additional claims, including claims involving the joinder of additional parties. In diversity cases, the district courts may exercise supplemental jurisdiction, except when doing so would be in-consistent with the jurisdictional requirements of the diversity statute which must be granted as matter of laws or facts to question the defendants criminal enterprises across the country against ["Deportable Aliens,"] or amother the or claims to be filed, or pending ["Motion for International Extradition by questioning (The Ant(s) Criminal Massive Issues by Genocide Reform Act ("MIGRA"), The applicability of this norm to private individuals is also confirmed by the Genocide Convention Implementation Act of 1987, 18 U.S.C. §(s) 1091 (1988), which criminalizes acts of genocide without regard to whether the offender is acting under color of law, see id. Section(s) 1091(a) ("[w]hoever" commits genocide shall be punished), Under the ["Alien Tort Act"]. ("ATA"), also law to be ratify, by The Ant(s) Act ("TAA"), Nothing in the Genocide Convention Implementation Act or its legislative history reveals an intent by Congress to repeal the Alien Tort Act insofar as it applies to genocide, or to remove secretive crimes within the ("INA") that is a matter of facts that is undisputable by both direct and circumstantial evidence to be conolidate these cases, where the plaintiff alleged similar discrimination by the the defendants across the country Fed.R.Civ.P. 42(a), and the cases applying , which circumscribe a district court's authority to consolidate civil actions for trial, or they were part of the same civil action as claims that satisfied diversity jurisdiction.

VI. Certification and Closing

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, by signing below, I certify to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief that this complaint: (1) is not being presented for an improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation; (2) is supported by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying, or reversing existing law; (3) the factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, will likely have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery; and (4) the complaint otherwise complies with the requirements of Rule 11.

A. For Parties Without an Attorney

I agree to provide the Clerk's Office with any changes to my address where case-related papers may be served. I understand that my failure to keep a current address on file with the Clerk's Office may result in the dismissal of my case.

Date of signing: 11/22/2021

Signature of Plaintiff S/Manetirony Clervrain

Printed Name of Plaintiff Manetirony Clervrain

B. For Attorneys

Date of signing: S/Manetirony

Signature of Attorney S/Manetirony Clervrain

Printed Name of Attorney Manetirony Clervrain

Bar Number not Applicable for those with evidence of competency

Name of Law Firm Brandako, Inc

Address 4326 S Scatterfield Rd Suite 153

Anderson

City

IN

State

46013

Zip Code

Telephone Number 7652789806

E-mail Address monticlerivain@gmail.com